

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,398	10/30/2003	James Ford Brett	OGC400/02811	7462
24118 7	7590 02/21/2006		EXAM	INER
HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN 228 W 17TH PLACE			LUKS, JEREN	MY AUSTIN
TULSA, OK			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2837	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<i>\\</i>				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/697,398	BRETT ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jeremy A. Luks	2837				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNION 36(a). In no event, however, may a rewill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONON coause the application to become AE	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 O	october 2003.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This						
•	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	•				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
" See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not	received.				
Attachment(s)	_					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10-30-2003. 		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6 and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brett (6,059,031) in view of Cole (6,244,839).

With respect to Claims 1-5, 9, and 14-20, Brett teaches a whirling mass (Figure 3, #16) attached to a shaft (40); means to rotate said mass (16) in a selected rotational direction to cause said mass (16) to backwards whirl in an opposite rotational direction (Col. 3, Lines 46-50); and means to maintain angular radial position and angular alignment between the ends (44) of said whirling mass (16); and transmitting centrifugal force created by said whirling mass (16) to a downhole casing (Col. 3 Lines 45-55), and transmitting vibrational energy (Col. 4, Lines 32-33).

Brett fails to teach a pair of spaced, coaxially aligned gerotors spaced from each other, each gerotor with an inner gear rotated by a shaft having one less lobe than an outer gear; and a pair of replaceable roller bearings attached to said shaft on opposite ends, each engaging a pair of replaceable sleeves.

Nevertheless, Cole teaches a pair of spaced, coaxially aligned gerotors (Figure 3, #132, 140) spaced from each other, each gerotor (132, 140) with an inner gear rotated by a shaft (121) having one less lobe than an outer gear (Figure 5, #143, 144); and a pair of replaceable roller bearings (138, 139) attached to said shaft (121) on opposite ends, each engaging a pair of replaceable sleeves (126). Cole inherently teaches wherein said inner gear backwards whirls at a speed defined by a factor K = n/(N-n), where n = number of lobes on inner rotor and N = number of lobes on outer rotor (Figure 5, #143, 144).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the rotating mass apparatus of Brett with the gerotor and bearing system of Cole in order to compensate for undesirable pressure effects in a gerotor system while maintaining a simplistic construction and fast-acting performance, and retaining the durability and dependability of the gerotor system.

With respect to Claims 6 and 8, Brett teaches a means (Col. 3, Lines 39-43) to rotate a mass (Figure 3, #16) in a selected rotational direction including a drive shaft (40) with a plurality of U-joints (Figure 1, #24). Cole teaches an inner gear (Figure 3, #132) and bearing (138).

Application/Control Number: 10/697,398

Art Unit: 2837

With respect to Claims 10-13, Brett teaches that the backwards-whirling mass (16) is an elongated cylinder with a diameter less than said housing (14) (Col. 3, Lines 30-33), and produces vibration energy that is used in enhanced fluid recovery, and used as a seismic source (Col 4, Lines 32-33).

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brett (6,059,031) in view of Cole (6,244,839), and further in view of Hoffman (5,996,739).

Brett teaches a fluid pump (Figure 3, #32, 34) powered by a shaft (40) (Col. 4, Lines 39-40). Brett fails to teach a self-contained drip lubrication system. On the other hand, Hoffman teaches a self-contained drip lubrication system (Col. 2, Lines 1-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the rotating mass apparatus of Brett and gerotor and bearing system of Cole with the a self-lubrication system to reduce friction and wear over time on the internal moving parts. It would have been obvious to use Hoffman's self-lubrication system because it provides a passive gravitational drip lubrication system that includes rate monitoring and control to provide a constant drip lubrication rate at all times, and is simpler and less expensive than actively pumped lubrication systems.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pertinent arts of record related to gerotor and bearing systems for a backwards-whirling mass orbital vibrator are disclosed in the PTO-892.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,398

Art Unit: 2837

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeremy A. Luks whose telephone number is (571) 272-2707. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Bradley can be reached on (571) 272-2800 x33. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeremy Luks
Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2837

Edgardo San Martin
Primary Patent Examiner